APPENDIX I.

(1) On the succession of the Dalavais of Kanthirava II.

In view of the variations among the authorities as regards the succession of the Daḷavāis of Kaṇṭhīrava II, it is necessary to go into the subject in some detail. According to the *Annals* (I. 156), Dāsarājaiya of Dēvarāyadurga, last of the Daḷavāis of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, was succeeded by Kāntaiya. Kāntaiya was slain during the siege of Chikballāpur and succeeded by his son Nanjarājaiya. Nanjarājaiya was followed by his son Basavarājaiya, who in turn was succeeded by a Nanjarājaiya and by Vīrarājaiya, son of Doḍḍaiya of Kaḷale. According to *Wilks* (I. 241), however, there were only two Daḷavāis during Kaṇṭhīrava's reign, namely, "Canty Raj" (Kāntaiya) and his son "Busoo Raj" (Basavarāja), the former of whom lost his life during the reduction of Chikballāpur and the latter carried it on to success, extending his conquests as far as Doḍballāpur and Miḍagēśi. The *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* of Venkaṭaramaṇaiya (p. 32) refers only to Nanjarājaiya as the Daḷavāi of Kaṇṭhīrava, to whom it accredits the successful siege of Chikballāpur, the subjugation of the Pāḷegārs of both the Balḷāpurs (Chikballāpur and Doḍballāpur) and Miḍagēśi and the extension of his operations as far as Sīra. According to the *Mys. Dho. Pūr.* (I. 70), an earlier source (*c.* 1710-1714), Dāsarājaiya of Dēvarāyadurga, last of the Daḷavāis of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, remained in office under Kaṇṭhīrava till March 12, 1705 (*Tāraṇa, Phālguṇa ba.* 13) when he was succeeded by Basavarājaiya (grandson of Kāntaiya of Kaḷale and second son of Nanjarājaiya I) who continued till November 4, 1708 (*Sarvadhāri, Mārgaśira śu.* 3).

Unfortunately, however, the characters in the original manuscript of this work are thoroughly defaced on p.71, rendering it impossible to make out the names of the successors of Basavarājaiya. The chronological and genealogical position of both the *Annals* and *Wilks* in regard to the Daḷavāis of Kaṇṭhīrava is rather vague, loose and contradictory. We have no information in these authorities as to the exact period of office of each of the Daḷavāis and their actual relationships. In particular, Kāntaiya, commonly mentioned by them as the first Daḷavāi of Kaṇṭhīrava, actually belonged to the Kaḷale family as we know from other sources, though he is referred to in the *Annals* (l. c.) as Kāntaiya of Kallahaḷḷi, apparently after the place of residence of this branch of the Kaḷale House, situated in the same taluk as Kaḷale (*vide* Ch. I, f.n. 13). Further, he is identical with Muppina-Kāntaiya of Kaḷale, grandfather of Basavarājaya, a position supported by the *Annals* and by the *Mys. Dho. Pūr.* and the *K.A.V.* (*vide* Table XIII). The siege of Chikballāpur took place in November-December 1710, according to both the *Mys. Dho. Pūr.* (II. 50) and the *Annals* (I. 156). There is no evidence,[1] and it is improbable, that Muppina-Kāntaiya, a very old man as his name itself indicates, was the Daḷavāi of Kaṇṭhīrava during 1705-1711 and that he took part and was slain in that action as both the *Annals* and *Wilks* would have us believe. Hence it is not safe to rely on them. Neither can we accept the order of succession of the other Daḷavāis of Kaṇṭhīrava confusedly mentioned in the *Annals*, unless it is supported by more acceptable data. On the other hand, the statements of the earliest available contemporary chronicle (*i.e., Mys. Dho. Pūr.*) that Daḷavāi Dāsarājaiya of Dēvarāyadurga was in office under Kaṇṭhīrava till March 1705 and that he

1. Cf. *Ancient India*, P. 305, where Dr. S. K. Aiyangar follows the *Annals*, without, as it seems to us, adequate evidence in support of his position.

was succeeded by Basavarājaiya, grandson of Muppina-Kāntaiya of Kaḷale, during 1705-1708, are more specific and creditworthy. Nanjarājaiya was the successor of Basavarājaiya and this is supported by the *Mys. Rāj. Cha.*, a manuscript next in point of time to the *Mys. Dho. Pūr.*, according to which he (Nanjarājaiya) was the Daḷavāi of Mysore during a major portion of the latter part of Kaṇṭhīrava's reign, actively figuring in the siege of Chikballāpur and other events (1710-1711). He is, perhaps, identical with Nanjarājaiya of Maddagiri, a nephew of Basavarājaiya of Kaḷale (see *K.A.V.*, ff. 18); also Table XIII). We would not, therefore, be far wrong in fixing his period of office between 1708-1714. Since the *Annals* (I. 159) is, however, positive only in regard to the period of office (*i.e.*, 1714-1724) of Daḷavāi Vīrarājaiya (another grandson of Muppina-Kāntaiya and son of Doḍḍaiya of Kaḷale) under both Kaṇṭhīrava II and Krishṇarāja I, we have to place his (Vīrarājaiya's) succession about February 1714.

(2) On the authorship of the Mysuru Dhoregala Purvabhyudaya Vivara.

This work has generally come to be known as Nagara Puṭṭaiya's *History of Mysore.* Wilson was the first to ascribe its authorship to Nagara Puṭṭaiya (*Des. Cat. Mack. Mss.*, pp. 329-330) and this position is followed in the *Kar. Ka. Cha.* (III. 4) and the *Mys. Gaz.* (II. iv. 2631). According to a Persian manuscript history of the early rulers of Mysore, referred to by Wilks, however, Nagara Puṭṭaiya was a contemporary of Tipū Sultān, who, in 1798, at the command of the latter, assisted Asad Anwar and Gulām Husain to translate into Persian "two books in the Canara (Kannaḍa) language". In 1799, after the fall of Tipū, Col. W. Kirkpatrick, one of the Commissioners for the affairs of Mysore, handed over to Major, afterwards Lieutenant-Colonel, Colin Mackenzie

two *Kaḍatams*[2], along with a book in the Kannaḍa language entitled "*The Succession of the Kings of Mysoor, from ancient Times as it is in the Canara Cuddutums, now written into a Book by Command by Nuggur Pootia Pundit.*" These manuscripts were "among the plunder of everything useful or apparently valuable, carried off to the stores of the Sultaun" on the death of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar VIII in 1796. They accidentally escaped destruction by fire, shortly after, "by the pious artifice of a bramin" and eventually fell into the hands of a British officer in the confusion of the 4th of May 1799," along with "a large portion of the contents" of an apartment of the Seringapatam Palace in which they had been lodged. It was from the book of Nagara Puṭṭaiya Paṇḍit, above referred to, that the Persian translation was made by Tipū Sultān in 1798 and subsequently an English translation also prepared, under Major Mackenzie's direction, for Wilks' use. The two *Kaḍatams*, however, proved, on examination by Wilks, "to be the actual originals" from which the Paṇḍit's copy was made, being, as he (Wilks) says, "probably the two books mentioned in the Persian translation" (*Mysoor*, I. Preface, pp. xxi-xxiv; II. 605). There appears little doubt that the original *Kaḍatam* entitled *Mysūru-Dhoregaḷa-Pūrvābhyuda y a-V i v a r a*,

2. Wilks gives an accurate description of a *Kaḍatam* or *Kaḍitam* thus: Cudduttum, Curruttum, or Currut, a long slip of cotton cloth, from eight inches to a foot wide and from twelve to eighteen feet long, skilfully covered on each side with a compost of paste and powdered charcoal. When perfectly dry, it is neatly folded up without cutting, in leaves of equal dimensions; to the two end folds are fixed ornamented plates of wood, painted and varnished, resembling the sides of a book and the whole is put into a case of silk or cotton or tied with a tape or ribbon; those in use with the lower classes are destitute of these ornaments and are tied up by a common string; the book, of course, opens at either side, and, if unfolded and drawn out, is still a long slip of the original length of the cloth. The writing is similar to that on a slate, and may be in like manner rubbed out and renewed. It is performed by a pencil of the *balapam*, or *lapis ollaris*....." (*Mysoor*, I. Preface, P. XXII, f. n.).

now in the Madras Oriental Mss. Library and used in the present work, is one of the two *Kaḍatams* above adverted to by Wilks and relied upon by Nagara Puṭṭaiya also. This *Kaḍatam* is a work of anonymous authorship and belongs to the period *c.* 1710-1714, as a detailed examination of it goes to show (*vide* text of Ch. I of this Vol.) The similarity in the title of both this original manuscript and its copy by Nagara Puṭṭaiya Paṇḍit perhaps largely accounts for the position that the latter himself was its actual author, which can no longer be accepted.

(3) Manucci on Mysore, 1705-1706.

In his *Storia Do Mogor* (Part IV, written 1701-1706)[3], Signor Niccolao Manucci, the well-known Venetian traveller in India, dealing with the last years of the reign of Aurangzīb, writes thus incidentally of Mysore under Kaṇṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar II :—

[1705]

" (*P.* 98).....Daud Khan, after making an agreement with the Mahrattahs, withdrew, and took up his abode in Arkāt, leaving the enemy present in the direction of Adoni and Sira.....Without troubling himself about the increasing ruin to his empire due to the Mahrattahs, this King [Aurangzib] now plans the renewal of war against Maisur [Mysore] or Saranpattan (Śrirangapaṭṭaṇam). His ambition is to capture the great treasure possessed by this Prince. This territory lies near the region of Malabar and the Prince possesses one hundred thousand matchlock men and ten thousand cavalry. His revenue, after paying expenses, is every year (*P.* 99) eleven *Carois* (Krors) of rupees—that is thirty-five millions.[4]

3. W. Irvine roughly fixes 1701-1705 as the chronological limits of Part IV of the *Storia* (see *Introduction* to the work, Part I. P. *LXXIV*). In the light of internal evidence, however, we have to place it between 1701-1706.

4. " Apparently 35,000,000 of some coin not named, worth 3 1/7 rupees each—probably the pagoda. Eleven *krors* of rupees equals about

He is lord over a large territory defended by over one hundred fortresses and many forests.

"This Prince has a Brahman as his Chief Counsellor named Duduhaja Daluahia (Duduhāja Daḷwae),[5] a man of sound judgment. The reigning prince is a nephew[6] of the late ruler, and is deaf. For this reason King Aurangzeb protests that this Prince is not a legitimate successor, and claims the right to take possession. Thus he is making ready for a campaign, and has sent out orders to the Princes of Tanjor, the Princes of Trichinopoly, and other neighbouring rulers who are his feudatories. They must be prepared to invade Maisur, and should they refuse compliance, they will, he says, be chastised.

"The King of Gulkandah, Shah Abdullah Qutb Shah [1611-1672] several times made war against this monarch [*i.e.*, of Maisur], hoping to obtain his treasures and territory. But he had no success, the said Prince defending himself valiantly; and the punishment he inflicted on his adversaries was to release them after cutting off their noses.

"They say that the inhabitants of this country (Maisur) are so active that when horsemen are passing through their forests, they come out rapidly, and, placing their hands on the horse's quarters, spring up behind,

£ 11,000,000. The figures must be grossly exaggerated" (Irvine's note No. 1 on pp. 99 of the *Storia*, Part IV). Nevertheless, Manucci is to be understood to be testifying here, as an impartial observer, to the vitality and financial soundness of the kingdom of Mysore.

5. The person referred to here seems identical with Daḷavāī Dāsarājaiya of Dēvarāyadurga, a member of the Arasu family (see Chs. XI and XII of Vol. I, and Ch. I of this Vol.). Manucci was evidently misinformed on the point. Cf. Irvine's note No. 2, l.c., referring to Duduhaja as "an epithet or nickname."

6. The reference here is to Kaṇṭhīrava-Narasarāja Woḍeyar II, son of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar of Mysore (*vide* references cited in Vol. I, Ch. XVI, f.n 10). Manucci and no less Aurangzīb was misinformed on this point also. Cf. the order of succession and dates of Mysore rulers, given by Irvine in note No. 2 *supra*, relying on Wilks and L. B. Bowring.

and cut off the rider's nose with a sort of half-moon in iron that they carry. By this feat so much (*P.* 100) fear was established in the (Mogul) army that no one was so bold as to advance until the musketeers had fired. No one can enter or leave the Maisur ruler's territories without a passport..... ....."

Again, after referring to Bijapur and other affairs, Manucci resumes :

"(P. 238) Meanwhile he [Aurangzīb] sent men to reconnoitre the route along which, as he pretended, his army would make its advance on its way to attack the Prince of Massur (Maisur). The same was done in regard to Tanniaur (Tanjor) and Triginapali (Trichinopoly) ; it was meant only as a means of intimidation and the extraction of money from them. With the same object he gave a fresh order for Daud Khan to return to the Karnatak. The Khan, assuming pleasant ways, feigned himself the friend of those princes, and advised them to offer handsome tribute to the Mogul if they wished to be liberated from imperial interference.

"These Princes are so ignorant that they paid what was demanded of them, without foreseeing the destruction which would overcome them therefrom ..... The said Daud Khan amassed all the money that he could from them and from the Europeans.....

"Daud Khan left the Court and came back to the Karnatik, and when he reached it all the European nations sent him their presents, which he accepted.....

"(P. 239) The Prince of Maisur was aware that, as soon as the rainy reason was over, King Aurangzeb would make war upon him. He therefore made ready to resist him with a force of fifteen thousand horsemen of different tribes—Pathans, Rajputs and Moguls, etc. The whole of these men came out of the Mogul empire; not finding employment at that Court, they went and took service with this Prince. I do not believe that

these men will be faithful to him; on the contrary, I know that Aurangzeb, following his custom, will be sure to invite them to desert his standard by an offer of higher pay, if he has not done this already (p. 240), as he has practised in the kingdoms of Bijapur and Gulkanda, and in other principalities. The said Prince suspected, however, that this tampering had taken place, and called a council of his principal officers. He asked them, in case such a desertion happened, what would be the remedy for the evil. They replied to him that he should place no reliance on those horsemen; in time of need his Highness had forty thousand captains, not to speak of the soldiers who fought under their standards, making a total of three hundred thousand men, all of them ready to defend his Highness.

"Within their own country this tribe consider themselves valiant soldiers, and are very tender on the point of honour. If by chance in going out from or coming into any place, their clothes are touched unintentionally, or when passing each other they cough or spit, they hold that there has been an affront, and they forthwith challenge each other to a duel. This sort of duel happens customarily two or more times in a day. They are fought in the presence of the Prince, who allows them because he cannot prevent them. These officers and soldiers are highly paid, and live very well; they are rather skilled in the use of weapons, and are accustomed to wear on their arms small armlets of gold or silver. In a few months from this time, if Aurangzeb lives, we shall see what sort of valour these soldiers have, and I shall not fail to give a clear report.

"Although this prince might easily lead this great army against the Mogul, he is an enemy of war, and it pleases him better to live in peace and amity. He offered to his Majesty fifteen millions of rupees and five elephants, promising, in addition, to double his

annual tribute, on condition that he was not interfered with. Aurangzeb accepted the proposal, and at once sent off a thousand horsemen to convey the money to his camp (p. 241). The Shivā Jis (the Mahrattahs) had information, and pursued the convoy, with twenty thousand horse, hoping to relieve them of the cash but the pursuers were not in time. The escort had retired with the utmost promptitude into a fortress, and up to this moment the money is locked up there.

"In the month of September of the said year [1705] King Aurangzeb fell ill, and for twelve days, he did not appear at the public audiences. The news caused a great commotion in the royal camp, since the greater number believed he was dead; the fact being that he unexpectedly fell into a swoon, and for three hours on end he was unable to speak a word..... ...

"(P. 242) when the King could move about, having recovered from his indisposition, the rainy season had ended. He sent men to measure the quantity of water in the rivers, preparatory to an attack on the Prince of Maisur, to whom he forwarded violent threats. At this time news was received by his Majesty that the villagers in the Province of Agrah had risen and plundered the suburbs of the City, and closed the roads in those parts. Very shortly afterwards other reports were received that some Pathan Chiefs, who ruled between the Province of Kabul and the Indus river, had risen in rebellion, and killed several soldiers of Prince Shah Alam, his son.

"From the coming of these reports the design of fighting the Prince of Maisur was frustrated; and the King withdrew his army to the neighbourhood of Aurangabad [read Ahmadnagar], having continually at his heels the Mahrattahs, who follow him everywhere.....

"(P. 243) His Majesty's retreat towards Aurangabad was against his will, his desire being to make war against the Prince of Maisur; but he had to postpone that

campaign in order to attend to the above rising. The king was greatly exercised in mind by these uprisings, the more so when he recollected that his undertakings had not been very successful and the common people had begun to speak disparagingly (P. 244) of his continual and fruitless marches. He issued a proclamation that, if any one spoke abusively about the royal marchings, his tongue would be pulled out the next morning early ..... [1706].

" (P. 245) The large sum of money sent by the Prince of Maisur as a present to his Majesty had been taken to a fortress called Sirpi,[7] situated in the vicinity of that Prince's territory. This money was recovered by the Prince of Maisur, and the fortress taken,[8] in the following manner. When this Prince saw that the King had retreated, and that his affairs were in a bad state, he made use of the opportunity, and bribed the soldiers who garrisoned the place. This was done very easily, since they were dying of hunger and had received no pay. They delivered up the fortress on April 18 [?1706].. ...."

7. Irvine identifies this with Supa in North Canara (*Storia*, IV. 245, f.n. 2). But Sirpi, with reference to the context, is identical with Sīra in the Karnāṭak-Bijāpur-Bālaghāṭ. Sīra, in the Tumkūr district, was a Mughal *subāh* since Khāsim Khān's time (1687-1695).

8. The reference to the taking of the fort of Sīra by Mysore appears to rest on the basis of a rumour current when Manucci wrote. The fort remained in the hands of the Mughals for a considerably long time, though it would seem that Kaṇṭhīrava, as narrated above, succeeded in taking back possession of the amount preserved therein for safety.